

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 50, No. 3

OCTOBER 26, 1956

WHOLE NO. 1214

CONTENTS

W. S. ANDERSON: Recent Work in Roman Satire (1937-55)	33
(A list of the earlier articles in this series appears on Page 35.)	
E. B. HARRISON: The Summer's Work in Greece, 1956	40
C. A. A. S.: Program of Autumn Meeting	41
Reviews	41
J. A. K. Thomson, <i>Classical Influences on English Prose</i> (Lind). A. Andrewes, <i>The Greek Tyrants</i> (McGregor). W. D. Ross, <i>Aristotelis De Anima</i> ; E. S. Forster and D. J. Furley, <i>Aristotle, On Sophistical Refutations, On Coming-To-Be and Passing-Away, On the Cosmos</i> (Long). E. L. Bennett, Jr., <i>The Pylos Tablets: Texts of the Inscriptions Found, 1939-1954</i> . (Brown). F. E. Adcock, <i>Caesar as Man of Letters</i> (Avery). S. P. Bovie, <i>Virgil's Georgics</i> (Duckworth). L. A. MacKay, <i>Janus</i> (Holland). N. H. Baynes, <i>Byzantine Studies and Other Essays</i> (Costas).	
C. W. SIEDLER: Rhetorical Devices in Caesar's Commentaries: Addenda	46
Notes and News	47
C.A.S., Autumn meetings. — Other fall meetings. — CW List of Classical Departments.	
Books Received	48

RECENT WORK IN ROMAN SATIRE (1937-55)

Introduction

This report covers the main representatives of Roman satire: specifically, Lucilius, Varro, Horace, Seneca, Persius, and Juvenal. Petronius, as more than a satirist, has been deliberately left to those who are more qualified to consider him. Since a special bibliography of Horace will appear later, I have felt no need to discuss the Epistles nor to consider the less relevant works concerning the general poetic activity of Horace. I have omitted Martial, because his epigrams deserve to be treated as a special genre, and I have passed over Ennius, because his few fragments have not permitted much significant study.

As the above would indicate, this bibliography does not purport to be exhaustive. In addition to the restrictions on writers considered, I should mention other factors which make it selective. I have not cited translations of Roman satire unless they appeared with the Latin text. I have not investigated the tradition of satire after Juvenal nor the survival of the individual satirists through the Middle Ages. Where work has been in the nature of a note on one or two lines of the text, I have chosen to omit it—there is, naturally, a great deal of this. Finally, I have not cited unpublished dissertations. Items of apparently some importance which I have not been able to consult are noted by an asterisk.

The last work in English treating satire as a developing form from Ennius to Juvenal dates just before the time when this report begins: J. W. Duff, *Roman Satire* (Berkeley 1936). R. Helm published a bibliography on Roman satirists for the years 1936-40 in *Bursian 282* (1943) 1-37. Another selective bibliography appeared in K. Büchner and J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Literatur und Sprache in der Forschung seit 1937* (Berne 1951) 22-33, covering the years 1937-50.¹

I. General Studies

Two major studies of satire appeared in 1949:

U. Knoche, *Die Römische Satire* (Berlin 1949), provides the best introduction to the genre now in print. Consideration of the origins of the form and careful discussion of each successive satirist. Includes Horace's Epistles and Petronius. Special emphasis on Ennius as

1. Obviously, this report would never have been possible without the resources of *L'Année Philologique*, complete up to 1953 at the time of writing (see Postscript). My abbreviations for periodicals depend upon its usage or, in some cases, upon the style sheet in *AJA* 56 (1952). Other aids for bibliography would be: N. I. Herescu, *Bibliographie de la littérature latine* (Paris 1953); *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (1949), especially s.v. Satire and Juvenal; *The Year's Work in Classical Studies*, available for 1937-47; and M. Platnauer (ed.), *Fifty Years of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford 1954). In addition, I should like to express my debt to L. H. Feldman for his searching and constructive criticism of this paper.

the father of Roman satire, on the assumption that he took over a Hellenistic practice.

O. Weinreich, *Römische Satiren* (Zürich 1949), in a less technical work, translates into German most of the surviving portions of satire, including Petronius. Writes a valuable introduction on the origin and nature of *Satura*, maintaining the position opposite to that of Knoche, namely, that satire springs from a native Roman dramatic form, as stated by Livy. N. Terzaghi also published a second edition of his book, *Per la storia della satira* (Messina 1944), with some additions. He is particularly interested in the diatribe element.

Other more specialized works:

L. Illuminati, *La satura odepatica latina: Introduzione, testi e commento* (Milan 1938), studies the travel motif in Roman literature, with special emphasis on Lucil. 3 and Hor. S. 1.5.

E. H. Haight, *The Roman Use of Anecdotes in Cicero, Livy, and the Satirists* (New York 1940).

N. Terzaghi, "Satira e poesia nella letteratura latina," *ASNP* 12 (1943) 99-110.*

H. Bardon, "Satiriques et élégiaques," *Latomus* 5 (1946) 215-224, discusses the satiric practice of parodying elegiac emotions.

II. *Lucilius*

Two new texts have been published:

N. Terzaghi (Florence 1944²) provides a critical text that takes into account criticisms of Marx; attempts to assign more fragments to specific books.

E. H. Warmington, *Remains of Old Latin III* (L.C.L. 1938), gives text, English translation, and some helpful notes. Both Terzaghi and Warmington change the numbering of Marx.

Special studies:

A. Mazzarino, "Per la tradizione di Lucilio," *Maia* 3 (1950) 137-141.*

J. S. T. Hanssen, *Latin Diminutives: A Semantic Study* (Bergen 1951) 133-149, treats the practice of Lucilius.

L. Robinson, "The Personal Abuse in Lucilius' Satires," *CJ* 49 (1953-54) 31-46, considers the invective and historical context.

D. Henss, "Ist das Luciliusfragment 9 (Marx echt? ", *Philologus* 98 (1954) 159-161, agrees with Hendrickson that Lucilius did not write the fragment, but that Persius imitated Lucretius.

The major critical work of this period is that of M. Puelma Piwonka, *Lucilius und Kallimachos: Zur Geschichte einer Gattung der Hellenistisch-römischen Poesie* (Frankfurt 1949), which develops the theories of Fiske. After many acute observations on the style and artistic purpose of Lucilius, Piwonka traces these same purposes in Callimachus and concludes that Lucilius consciously imitated the Alexandrian. Severely criticized by Büchner.

Other more general treatments:

G. Coppola, *Gaio Lucilio, cavaliere e poeta* (Bologna 1941), an enthusiastic biography.

E. Bignone, *Storia della Letteratura Latina* (Florence 1945) II 11ff., chapter on Lucilius.

G. De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani* (Florence 1953) IV, Part II, Tome I 49ff., chapter on Lucilius; not very perceptive.

III. *Varro's Menippean Satires*

The study of Varro the satirist has been almost exclusively the work of Italian scholars

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published weekly from October for sixteen (16) issues, except for any weeks in which there is an academic vacation. Volume 50 (1956-57) contains issues dated October 5, 19, 26; November 16, 30; December 14 (1956); January 7, 14; February 4, 25; March 4, 11, 25, April 8, 29; May 6 (1957).

Owner and Publisher, The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of publication, Fordham University, 441 East Fordham Road, New York 58, N. Y.

General subscription price, \$3.75 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$4.25. Price to members of the C. A. A. S. \$3.25. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers, to subscribers, 20 cents, to others, 30 cents prepaid (otherwise 30 cents and 40 cents). If Affidavit to invoice is required, 60 cents must be added to the subscription price. For residents of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, a subscription to **THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY** (or, alternatively, to the **Classical Journal**) is included in the membership fee of the C. A. A. S.; whose members may also take **Classical Outlook**, **Classical Journal**, and **Classical Bulletin** at special prices in combination available from the Secretary-Treasurer of the C. A. A. S., Prof F. Gordon Stockin, Houghton College, Houghton, N. Y.

Reentered as second class matter December 14, 1950 at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925 authorized December 14, 1950.

STAFF

EDITOR

Edward A. Robinson Fordham University, New York 58, N. Y.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Herbert W. Benario	Columbia University, New York 27, N. Y.
Louis H. Feldman	Yeshiva University, New York 33, N. Y.
Evelyn B. Harrison	Columbia University, New York 27, N. Y.
Richard M. Haywood	New York University, New York 53, N. Y.
Martin Oswald	Columbia University, New York 27, N. Y.
John F. Reilly	Sacred Heart High School, Yonkers, N. Y.
William H. Stahl	Brooklyn College, Brooklyn 10, N. Y.

during this period, and F. Della Corte has dominated the scene. Now, at last, he has produced a text and commentary on the Menippean Satires (Genoa 1953)*. I have not seen this, however, nor a related work: "Suspiciones," *In memoriam A. Beltrami* (Genoa 1954) 69-81*.

Other work has devoted itself to reconstruction of the remains of Varro or to other textual problems:

B. Mosca, "Satira filosofica e politica nelle Menippee di Varrone," *ASNP* 6 (1937) 41-77. Contemporary relevance of the Satires.

O. Weinreich, "Varro und die Geschichte des Pantomimus," *Hermes* 76 (1941) 96-100. Interpretation of frag. 513.

F. Della Corte, "Per il testo delle Menippee," *RFIC* 20 (1942) 201-213; also, "Rileggendo le Menippee," *GIF* 1 (1948) 69-76. Textual questions.

E. Bignone, "Le Satire Menippee di Varrone," *Studi Mondolfo* (Bari 1950) 321-344.

L. Alfonsi, "Intorno alle Menippee di Varrone," *RFIC* 30 (1952) 1-37. Attempt to reconstruct *Endymiones*.

IV. Horace

The scholarly world celebrated the bimillenary anniversary of the birth of Horace in 1936, and thus we enter a new era in 1937. Since then, one new critical text has made its appearance, that of F. Klingner, *Q. Horati Flacci Carmina* (Leipzig 1939 [1950]²). Klingner's contribution to Horatian textual problems has been brilliantly assessed in the review by P. Levine, *AJP* 75 (1954) 85-94.

A number of studies have concentrated on the influences operative upon the poet, philosophical and environmental, as well as literary:

A. K. Michels, "Parrhesia and the Satire of Horace," *CP* 39 (1944) 173-177. Follows DeWitt and indicates the influence of Philodemus' essay on frankness upon the theory of Horace's Satires.

A. Ronconi, *Orazio Satiro* (Bari 1946). Good introduction and Italian translation.

W. Wili, *Horaz und die Augusteische Kultur* (Basel 1948) 86-116. Chapters on Horace's personal and artistic development as inferred from the Satires.

A. Ardizzone, "Il problema della satira in Orazio," *RFC* 27 (1949) 161-176. Considers the poetic theory of S. 1.4 and 10 in terms of that of Croce.

Q. Cataudella, "Filodemo nella Satira I 2

di Orazio," *PP* 5 (1950) 18-31. Epicurean influence. This point is further considered by:

M. Gigante, "Cercida, Filodemo, e Orazio," *RFIC* 83 (1955) 286-293. Suggests additional importance of Cercidas.

V. D'Antò, "Ancora sulla critica di Orazio a Lucilio," *MCI* 18 (1951) 10-17. In calling *Lucilius incompositus* and *durus*, Horace refers to his meter, especially his typical use of spondees.

A. Serafini, "Inquietudine di Orazio," *Maia* 6 (1953) 257-270. The Satires (e.g. 2.7.11ff.) and other works reflect the poet's anxiety.

There has been one study of the arrangement of the Satires: R. Hanslik, "Untersuchungen zu dem ersten Satirenbuch des Horaz," *Comment. Wind.* 3 (1937) 19-31, stressed the fact that 1.7

Dr. Anderson's article is the fourteenth in the CW series of Surveys of recent work in the various fields of classical scholarship and teaching. The earlier papers have been:

E. H. Haight, "Notes on Recent Publications about the Ancient Novel," *CW* 46 (1952-53) 233-237.

G. M. Kirkwood, "A Survey of Recent Publications Concerning Classical Greek Lyric Poetry," *CW* 47 (1953-54) 33-42, 49-54.

W. Allen, Jr., "A Survey of Selected Ciceronian Bibliography, 1939-1953," *CW* 47 (1953-54) 129-139.

P. MacKendrick, "Herodotus: The Making of a World Historian," *CW* 47 (1953-54) 145-152.

E. L. Minar, Jr., "A Survey of Recent Work in Pre-Socratic Philosophy," *CW* 47 (1953-54) 161-170, 177-182.

A. K. Michels, "Early Roman Religion, 1945-1952," *CW* 48 (1954-55) 25-35, 41-45.

G. F. Else, "A Survey of Work on Aristotle's Poetics, 1940-1954," *CW* 48 (1954-55) 73-82.

C. W. Mendell, "Tacitus: Literature 1948-1953," *CW* 48 (1954-55) 121-125.

A. G. McKay, "A Survey of Recent Work on Aeschylus," *CW* 48 (1954-55) 145-150, 153-159.

P. De Lacy, "Some Recent Publications on Epicurus and Epicureanism," *CW* 48 (1954-55) 169-177.

F. M. Combellack, "Contemporary Homeric Scholarship: Sound or Fury?", *CW* 49 (1955-56) 17-26, 29-44, 45-53.

H. W. Miller, "A Survey of Recent Euripidean Scholarship, 1940-1954," *CW* 49 (1955-56) 81-92.

C. T. Murphy, "A Survey of Recent Work on Aristophanes and Old Comedy," *CW* 49 (1955-56) 201-211.

F. M. Wassermann's report on Thucydides will appear in No. 5 (Nov. 30), G. M. Kirkwood's on Sophocles in No. 8 (Jan. 14).

and 8 are late, that Horace composed 1.1 and 2 first, and 1.4 before 1.3.

Several of the Satires have received special treatment:

H. Herter, "Zur ersten Satire des Horaz," *RhM* 94 (1951) 1-42. Despite the criticisms of previous writers, 1.1 does have unity.

N. Rudd, "Had Horace Been Criticized? A Study of *Serm. I 4*," *AJP* 76 (1955) 165-175. Reconsiders the views of Hendrickson, *AJP* 21 (1900) 121-142.

N. Rudd, "The Poet's Defense: A Study of Horace *Serm. 1.4*," *CQ* 49 (1955) 142-156. Further develops his views on the artistic purpose of 1.4. These two articles by Rudd are of major importance for their view of Horace's satiric purpose.

V. D'Antò, "Il viaggio di Orazio da Roma a Brindisi," *RendNap* 24-25 (1949-50) 235-255. A new interpretation of the relevance of 1.5.

J. Marouzeau, "En voyage avec Horace (*Sat. 1.5*)," *BACILG* 1 (1953) 1-9. A brief summary of its original, in Portuguese, will be found in *APh* 23 (1952) 87.

H. A. Musurillo, "Horace's Journey to Brundisium—Fact or Fiction?," *CW* 48 (1954-55) 159-162. Arguments for the view that 1.5 is fiction.

W. S. Anderson, "'Poetic Fiction'—Horace, *Serm. 1.5*," *CW* 49 (1955-56) 57-59. — Arguments against Musurillo, on the basis of the observations of D'Antò.

E. T. Salmon, "Horace's Ninth Satire in its Setting," *Studies G. Norwood* (Toronto 1952), 184-193. Traces Horace's walk with the bore, attempting to assign specific places to various scenes.

F. Castagnoli, "Note di topografia romana," *BullComm* 74 (1952) 49-56. Denies the validity of Salmon's proposals.

G. D'Anna, "Oraziani i primi versi della decima satira?," *Maia* 8 (1955) 26-42. Horace did write the verses beginning 1.10, but later, in a second edition, he suppressed them, since the attack on Cato had lost its relevance.

J. Nemeč, "Horatius a Lucilius," *LF* 72 (1948) 15-25, treats 1.10 (in Czech).

E. F. Leon, "The Psychiatric Cases in Horace, *Satires 2,3*," summarized in *TAPA* 80 (1949) 427, argues that Horace drew from life some of his portraits and did not restrict himself to literary types.

Other studies have concentrated on grammatical, textual, and metrical matters:

G. Bonfante, *Los elementos populares en la lengua de Horacio* (Diss., Madrid 1937). A linguistic study of Horace, with careful discussion of each word considered popular.

E. Städler, "Ueber den Gebrauch vielsilbiger Wortbildungen bei Horaz," *Glotta* 27 (1938) 199-206.

K. Büchner, "Der Superlativ bei Horaz," *Hermes* 79 (1944) 113-126. Different usage according to the nature of the work, Satire or Ode.

E. A. Hahn, "Horace's Use of Concrete Examples," *CW* 39 (1945-46) 82-86, 90-94. The value of examples, primarily in the Odes, for developing Horace's argument.

A. Y. Campbell, "On the Cruces of Horace, *Satires 2,2*," *CQ* 45 (1951), 136-142, discusses the problems of the following lines: 1-3, 23-35, 89-98, and 123.

N.-O. Nilsson, *Metrische Stildifferenzen in den Sätzen des Horaz* (*Studia Latina Holmicensia I*, Uppsala 1952). Although reviewers have criticized this work as excessive, it possesses major importance for its new approach to Horace's meter. Interprets meter as an integral part of the total poetic effect and points out the qualities which distinguish the satiric hexameter. Valuable statistical tables.

V. Seneca's Apocolocyntosis

Seneca's brief satiric work has excited considerable study in this period. Three separate Italian editions have appeared concentrating on it alone: those of A. Rostagni (Turin 1944); A. Ronconi (Milan 1947); and C. F. Russo (Florence 1948).

All three are accompanied with Italian translations. W. B. Sedgwick also issued a text, together with Petronius and certain relevant Pompeian inscriptions (Oxford 1950²). Scholars have also devoted their attention to various textual problems:

K. Barwick, "Senecas *Apocolocyntosis*: eine zweite Ausgabe des Verfassers," *RhM* 98 (1943) 159-173. Our text is the second edition of the work.

C. Gallo, *L'apocolocintosi di Seneca: saggio critico* (Arona 1948).

C. F. Russo, "Studi sulla *Divi Claudi Apokolokyntōsis*," *PP* 1 (1946) 241-259. Preliminary to the edition of 1948; textual problems and the significance of the title.

M. T. Cardini, "Apokolokyntōsis, i.e., *Apotheosis*," *Paideia* 3 (1948) 272-273. Criticism of Russo.

C. F. Russo, "Glose in librum De ludo Claudi Annei Senecæ," *PP* 7 (1952) 48-65.

The greatest amount of interest has focused upon the significance of the title and the historical relevance of the work:

V. Renard, "Suetône et l'*Apocoloquintose*," *RBPh* 15 (1937) 5-13. Suetonius' portrait of Claudius influenced by Seneca's earlier work.

L. Herrmann, "Le problème de l'*Apocoloquintose*," *RBPh* 17 (1939) 267. Summary of a lecture.

J. M. C. Toynbee, "Nero artifex: the *Apocolocyntosis* Reconsidered," *CQ* 36 (1942) 83-93. The literary and political purpose.

F. A. Todd, "Some *cucurbitaceae* in Latin Literature," *CQ* 37 (1943) 101-111. The meaning of the title as deduced from other uses of the term.

J. M. K. Martin, "Seneca the Satirist," *G&R* 14 (1945) 64-71. General appreciation.

F. Bornmann, "Apokolokyntôsis," *PP* 4 (1950) 69-70. Again, the title.

L. Deroy, "Que signifie le titre de l'*Apocoloquintose*?" *Latomus* 10 (1951) 311-318.

B. M. Marti, "Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* and *Octavia*, a Diptych," *AJP* 73 (1952) 24-36. The place of the work in Seneca's literary activity.

G. Gianotti, "Il posto della biografia nella problema senechiana I: Dall'esilio al Ludus," *RAL*, Ser. 8a, 8 (1953) 52-68.

Finally, studies which have concentrated on particular portions of the work:

V. Johnson, "Note on the *Ludus de morte Claudi Caesaris*," *CJ* 33 (1937-38), 486-487. Allusions in ch. 6.

I. Levy, "Le légende d'Osiris et Isis chez Séneque," *Latomus* 10 (1951) 147-167. Comments on ch. 15.

VI. Persius

Persius has been much neglected in this period, particularly in the English-speaking countries. In 1936, the Italians celebrated the 1900th anniversary of his birth, on which occasion they issued a special collection of essays in Volterra. After that momentary resurrection, Persius lapsed back into virtual oblivion. The major studies in this period have come from Germany, in the form of the text and translation of O. Seel (Munich 1950) and two very distinguished dissertations concerning the verbal technique of the satirist:

W. Kugler, *Des Persius Wille zu sprachlicher*

Gestaltung in seiner Wirkung auf Ausdruck und Composition (Berlin 1940). Reviewed with some hostility in *Gnomon* 19 (1943) 258-264, this represents a new and positive approach to Persius. Attempts to detect an artistic purpose in the proverbially difficult phrases and transitions, and ends with a defense of the unity of S. 3, in opposition to the views of Hendrickson.

D. Henss, *Studien zur Imitationstechnik des Persius* (Unpublished Diss., Marburg 1951), which I have not seen. From the dissertation, however, Henss has published two articles, which suggest the importance of his findings: "Ist das Luciliusfragment 9 (Marz) echt?", *Philologus* 98 (1954) 159-161. Agrees with Hendrickson, but for additional reasons, that Persius 1.1 imitates Lucretius. Also: "Die Imitationstechnik des Persius," *Philologus* 99 (1955) 277-294. Summary of the different methods exploited by the satirist in borrowing from his predecessors.

There have been two other editions in this period, neither of which I have seen: that of M. Dolç (Barcelona 1949)*, with commentary, and that of A. Mancini (Florence 1950)*, with introduction, translation, and notes.

In addition to these, Persius has received general study from a number of scholars:

A.-M. Guillemin, "Le satirique Persé," *LEC* 7 (1938) 161-167.

J. M. K. Martin, "Persius: Poet of the Stoics," *G&R* 8 (1939) 172-182.

E. V. Marmorale, *Persio* (Florence 1941). Enthusiastic study of the poetic purpose and artistic qualities of Persius.

W. Kroll, art. "A. Persius Flaccus," *RE*, Suppl. VII (1940) 972-979.

V. Ciaffi, *Introduzione a Persio* (Turin 1942). By far the best general criticism Persius has received in many years. Particularly good on the influence of Stoicism.

Finally, brief questions:

D. M. Robathan, "Notes on the Apparatus of Leo's Edition of Persius," *TAPA* 68 (1937) 123-128, points to many errors, due especially to Leo's failure to differentiate between correcting hands in the MSS.

W. C. Korfmacher, "A Résumé of the Persius-Nero Question," *TAPA* 69 (1938) xlii. Advocates caution.

J. W. Spaeth, Jr., "Persius on Epicurus: a Note on *Satires* 3.83-84," *TAPA* 73 (1942) 119-122. Persius refers to Epicurus by *aegroti veteris*.

E. Faria, "A formaçao da personalidade de Persio," *Humanitas* 2 (1948-49) 55-65*, deals with the influence of family environment upon Persius.

W. Clausen, "Codex Vat. Reginensis 1560 of Persius," *TAPA* 80 (1949) 238-244, gives a detailed collation of the Ms. and corrects the assumptions of an earlier collator, that the Ms. showed definite influence of L.

L. Herrmann, "Les premières œuvres de Perse," *Latomus* 11 (1952) 199-201, emends the *Vita* to support his contention that the early works of Persius were political in character and thus had to be destroyed. Also, a summary of a lecture of Herrmann's on S. 3 will be found in *RBPh* 32 (1954) 303.

L. Herrmann, "Perse écolier," *RBPh* 33 (1955) 317-319. Emends the *Vita*, in order to remove the conflict with 3.44ff.

P. Frassinetti, "Note a Persio e Giovenale," *RFIC* 83 (1955) 405-414. Notes on 1.4-5 and 5.61.

H. Hommel, "Die Frühwerke des Persius," *Philologus* 99 (1955) 266-276. Emends *Vita* to show that Persius wrote as a boy a book of *Aporiai* and a tragedy.

W. Schmid, "Zur Deutung der Persiusvita," *Philologus* 99 (1955) 319-320. Denial of the proposals of Hommel.

VII. Juvenal

Juvenal has aroused more comment than any other satirist, and several studies have assumed great importance, both as valuable in themselves and as provocative of further investigation. By far the greatest contribution to our knowledge of the satirist has been the magnificent text of U. Knoche (Munich 1950), the fruit of twenty-five years of intensive labor. As a background to the text, we should here cite Knoche's monumental "Handschriftliche Grundlagen des Juvenaltextes," *Philologus, Suppl.* 33.1 (1940), in which he traces the manuscript tradition carefully and brilliantly. Knoche has also translated his text (Munich 1951).

In addition, L. Kelling and A. Suskin, *Index Verborum Juvenalis* (Chapel Hill 1951), have finally put at the disposal of scholars a reliable index.

The other major production during this period has been that of G. Hight, *Juvenal the Satirist: A Study* (Oxford 1954), this, too, the fruit of many years of labor. It has suffered criticism in *CP* 50 (1955) 146-148, and *CR* 69 (1955) 278-281, but it undeniably has special

merits, particularly in its notes and select bibliography.

Of less importance is the text of G. Vitali (Bologna 1947).

The more general criticism of Juvenal has emerged from Italy:

E. Aguglia, "Giovenale e la critica recente," *A&R* 41 (1939) 135-151. Review of criticism as of 1939, largely influenced by Crocean theories.

T. Quacquarelli, *Giovenale* (Trani 1939).

C. Marchesi, *Giovenale* (Milan 1940).

B. Croce, "Giovenale," in *Poesia antica e moderna: Interpretazioni* (Bari 1943), 102-107. Estimate of the poetic qualities of the satirist according to Croce's renowned aesthetic principles.

N. Salanitro, *Introduzione a Giovenale* (Naples 1944). Concern with the poetical and rhetorical aspects.

E. V. Marmorale, *Giovenale* (Bari 1950²). The first edition of the book received the blessing of Croce, but not of foreign critics. The second edition consists of the same material, plus a reply to hostile criticism.

A. Serafini, "La poesia nella satira di Giovenale," *Maia* 3 (1950) 81-94. Attempts to qualify the Italian theory, that Juvenal was a mere *letterato*, by indicating poetic virtues.

Other scholars have concerned themselves with particular Satires. American Juvenalians have especially attacked the problem of structure. The Oxford Fragment, too, has been the center of controversy:

W. C. Helmbold, "The Structure of Juvenal I," *UCPCP* 14 (1951) 47-60. Careful consideration of the composition of S. 1 as the basis for textual criticism. Deletes a number of lines.

C. E. Lutz, "Any Resemblance . . . is Purely Coincidental," *CJ* 46 (1950-51) 115-120. Interpretation of 1. 170-171.

J. O. Thompson, "Juvenal's Big-Fish Satire," *G&R* 21 (1952) 86-87, emphasizes borrowed motifs, especially from Horace S. 2.2 and Statius.

W. C. Helmbold and E. N. O'Neil, "The Structure of Juvenal IV," *AJP* 77 (1956) 68-73. Important attack on the problem of the relation between the opening paragraph (1-27) and the remainder of the Satire.

B. Axelson, "A Problem of Genuineness in Juvenal," *Dragma M. P. Nilsson* (Lund 1939) 41-55. Additional reasons for rejecting the Oxford Fragment.

U. Knoche, "Ein Wort zur Echtheitskritik,"

Philologus 93 (1938) 196-217. Violent attack on the genuineness of the Oxford Fragment.

J. Colin, "Juvénal, les baladins et les rétiaries d'après le manuscrit d'Oxford," *AttiTor* 87 (1952-53) 315-386. Against some of Knoche's arguments. Shows that the Oxford Fragment makes sense; but cannot answer the manuscript problem, why only the Bodleian manuscript has this bit.

F. A. Wright, *Juvenal, A Satire on Woman* (London 1938). Translation of S. 6.

C. Gallo, "Fonti e imitazioni della sesta satira di Giovenale," *Orpheus* 2 (1955) 76-82, stresses a Plautine prototype.

W. S. Anderson, "Juvenal 6: A Problem in Structure," *CP* 51 (1956) 73-94. Attempt to demonstrate the thematic unity of S. 6.

E. Bickel, "Zur Gebetssatire Juvenals und den Interpolationsproblem," *RhM* 92 (1943) 89-94. Concerning 10.54-55.

W. C. Helmbold, "Juvenal's Twelfth Satire," *CP* 51 (1956) 14-23. An attack on the apparent interpolations in S. 12, in order to make it an intelligible poem. Deletes seventeen lines.

G. Highet, "A Fight in the Desert," *CJ* 45 (1949-50) 94-96. A parallel for the weird cannibalism in S. 15.

Finally, considerations of particular points in Juvenal. As the most productive writer in this period, Gilbert Highet merits the place of honor:

G. Highet, "The Life of Juvenal," *TAPA* 68 (1937) 480-506. The satirist's biography reconstructed. Expanded in the early chapters of *Juvenal the Satirist*.—"The Philosophy of Juvenal," *TAPA* 80 (1949) 254-270. Emphasis on Epicurean qualities in the later books.—"Juvenal's Bookcase," *AJP* 72 (1951) 369-394. Literary influences operative on the satirist.—"Sound Effects in Juvenal's Poetry," *Studies in Philology* 48 (1951) 697-706. Juvenal's skillful use of sound and meter.

E. Smeno, "Zur Technik der Personenzeichnung bei Juvenal," *SymbOslo* 17 (1937) 77-102. Juvenal's method of emphasizing salient characteristics in the people he portrays.

G. M. Hirst, *Collected Classical Papers* (Oxford 1938) 65ff. Various observations on Juvenal, especially his organization of phrases and paragraphs.

M. R. Posani, "Precisazioni critiche sulla poesia di Giovenale," *A&R* 11 (1943) 103-120. A very intelligent analysis of Juvenal's poetry,

with emphasis on the necessary dangers of his rhetorical style.

G. B. A. Fletcher, "Alliteration in Juvenal," *DUJ* 36 (1943-44) 59-64, produces examples and statistics on alliteration. He counts 1284 cases.

T. Kleberg, "Juvenal in the *Carmina latina epigraphica*," *Eranos* 44 (1946) 421-425.

G. Jachmann, "Studien zu Juvenal," *Gött-Nachr* (1946) 187-266. A provocative development of Leo's theory of *Doppelassungen* in analysis of some of the most difficult portions of the text.

B. Lavagnini, "Motivi diatribici in Lucrezio e Giovenale," *Athenaeum* 25 (1947) 83-88. Aspects of diatribe in Juvenal.

B. L. Ullman, "Psychological Foreshadowing in the *Satires* of Horace and Juvenal," *AJP* 71 (1950) 408-416. Ingenious methods of introducing names by verbal manipulation. Refers to 1.7ff; 1.47ff.; 4.15ff.; 6.462ff.

R. Verdière, "Contribution à une pagination nouvelle des 'Satires' de Juvénal," *Latomus* 11 (1952), 327-333. Assumed pagination of the archetype.

L. Herrmann, "Sur la disposition de l'original de Juvénal," *Latomus* 11 (1952) 334-336. Expands Verdière's theories.

L. Herrmann, "Comment Quintilien a loué Juvénal," *Latomus* 11 (1952) 451-453.

W. S. Anderson, "Juvenal: Evidence on the Years A.D. 117-28," *CP* 50 (1955) 255-257. Juvenal provides negative evidence for the immediate adoption of beards by Romans upon the accession of Hadrian.

M. A. Levi, "Aspetti sociali della poesia di Giovenale," *Studi G. Funaioli* (Rome 1955) 170-180. Social criticism, especially in S. 3, 8, and 16.

Conclusion

We cannot claim that this has been an era of striking discovery in Roman satire, though activity has never ceased. As the most important achievements, I would note the critical texts of Terzaghi, Della Corte, Klingner, and Knoche; the studies of Clausen which will soon be crowned by his new critical edition of Persius; and Highet's study of Juvenal.

The vigorous activity that resulted from Marx's edition of Lucilius (Leipzig 1904) and from the controversy over the origin and meaning of *satura* spent itself before 1936. As the main trends of the new period (1937-55), we ob-

serve an interest in literary affinities, linguistic questions, problems of structure, meter, metaphor, and imitative techniques. Here, I cite especially Puelma Piwonka (Lucilius), Rudd (Horace), Helmbold (Juvenal), Nilsson (Horace), Kugler (Persius), and Henss (Persius).

For the future, if I should suggest areas ripe for study, I would first call for a more careful general investigation of the poetic qualities and conventions of Roman satire, an area not touched by Duff and insufficiently explored by Knoche. As for particular problems, it seems to me that Lucilius needs a linguistic study and some qualitative distinction between his earlier and later books, and the area re-opened by Rudd should be increasingly worked; that Horace requires more study of Book 2 and its special nature, especially the purpose of the satirist and his means of personal interpretation; that Persius would most benefit from study, especially of his structure as related to his construction of phrases and conceits, since nobody yet has been able to explain Persius' success or his failure without resorting to extremes; that Juvenal still demands understanding of his structure in relation to his rhetorical purpose, together with an explanation of the changes he worked on satire.

In short, much remains to challenge our interest.

WILLIAM S. ANDERSON

YALE UNIVERSITY

POSTSCRIPT.

The latest supplement of *L'Année Philologique* (for 1954) appeared after this report had been compiled. I add the works there registered which I consider most important, though I have not read them: I. Mariotti, "I grecismi di Lucilio," *Studi Urbinati* 28 (1954) 357-386; T. Ciresola, *La formazione del linguaggio poetico di Persio* (Rovereto 1953); and E. Merone, "L'infinitivo aoristico in Persio," *GIF* 7 (1954) 244-255.

OCTOBER 1956

W.S.A.

THE SUMMER'S WORK IN GREECE, 1956

For classicists the crowning event of the past summer in Athens was the dedication, on September 3, of the newly reconstructed Stoa of Attalos as the Museum of the Agora Excavations. Since this, the twenty-fifth year of the American excavations in the Agora, was at the same time the seventy-fifth year of the American School of Classical Studies, under whose auspices these excavations have been carried out, the celebration of the opening of the Museum was expanded to a three-day festival.

The celebration began with a commemora-

tion of the School's anniversary at the Genadion Library on Saturday, September 1, and culminated in the dedication of the Stoa on Monday morning in the presence of their Majesties the King and Queen of the Hellenes. Members of the American School who had found a large part of their time and energies absorbed during most of the summer in preparations for the occasion were rewarded by a highly successful debut of the Stoa as a public building and of the Museum as a visual interpreter of the Agora and its history. The vast double colonnade of the ground floor is breath-taking in its monumentality, and one has only to step inside it to realize that this space is the element for and around which the whole structure was designed. The facade, giving little impression from the outside of the depth of the building itself, serves as an impressive eastern boundary to the Agora as a whole.

The text of the Agora is its monuments; individual finds, even one so massive as the great cult statue of Apollo Patroos, are little more than footnotes. Hence it is fitting that the display of finds, limited to a long gallery made by joining a number of the ancient shops and to special exhibits, e.g. wine-jars, in shops that have kept their ancient form, gives greatest prominence to objects which illustrate the ancient life of the area, the private possessions of early and post-classical Athenians and the public antiquities of the classical age. Study collections of pottery and small finds will be housed on the upper floor of the Stoa. Sculpture and inscriptions will be displayed in the ground floor colonnade.

* * *

Elsewhere in Greece American excavators focused attention on the prehistoric period. At Lerna in the Argolid John L. Caskey, Director of the American School, probed deep into the neolithic levels, discovering house-walls, complete burials (especially welcome since neolithic skeletons from Greece are still a rarity) and a terracotta female figurine of unusual beauty, exceptional for its period in being not steatopygous but callipygous. Carl W. Blegen's University of Cincinnati expedition at Pylos uncovered the women's quarters of King Nestor's palace, with a hearth that is a smaller replica of the hearth in the great megaron (its smoke pygous but callipygous. Carl W. Blegen's Unneys imitating the king-sized chimneys of the megaron) and a dressing-room with dolphins painted on its floor.

The large summer session of the American

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE ATLANTIC STATES

AUTUMN MEETING

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1956

10:00 A. M.

MUSIC ROOM, THE CHALFONTE

The Chalfonte-Haddon Hall, Atlantic City, New Jersey

PROGRAM

WANDERINGS IN ROMAN BRITAIN: Lucile Noble, Upper Darby High School, Philadelphia

CLASSICAL PERIODICALS IN AMERICA, 1956: Edward A. Robinson, Fordham University,
New York

SUMMER SESSION, 1956 (illustrated): Ann Scheible, Wake Junior High School, Irondequoit, New York

There will be a brief question-and-answer period following each paper, and, at the conclusion of the program, an informal half-hour designed to give the members and friends of the Association an opportunity to become better acquainted socially, and to meet the speakers. Your colleagues, friends, and interested students will be cordially welcomed.

Members intending to stop at the Chalfonte or the Haddon Hall should make early reservations with The Chalfonte-Haddon Hall, Leeds and Lippincott Company, Atlantic City, New Jersey.

School (twenty-five members) combined diversity and congeniality to an unusual degree. Under the veteran leadership of William B. Dinsmoor they penetrated deeper into the mysteries of Greek sites and structures than the average summer student is wont to do. As the rapid progress of post-war Greece in the field of touristic comfort has made it difficult for the present generation of students to compete with their predecessors in tales of hardship, this year's group pioneered in a new direction, that of luxury. A milestone in Hellenic travel was passed with their help when for the first time a mammoth red Pullman bus (complete with refrigerator for dispensing soft drinks en route) rolled into the square of Andritsaina, the Arcadian village whence one mounts beasts for Bassae, only a few hours late because of the necessity of remodeling bridges along the way to accommodate the monster.

EVELYN B. HARRISON

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

BOOK REVIEWS

J. A. K. THOMSON. *Classical Influences on English Prose*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1956. Pp. xiii, 303. \$3.75 (16s.). (American distributor: Macmillan Co., 60 Fifth Ave., New York 11, N. Y.)

With this book and three others, *The Classical Background of English Literature*, *Classical Influences on English Poetry*, and *Shakespeare and the Classics*, Professor Thomson has made the wide area of classical influences on English literature peculiarly his own. By no means as thorough, detailed, or documented as Gilbert Highet's *The Classical Tradition* (the classic of this kind of highly important scholarship) and dealing, of course, only with English literature, Thomson's book is a pleasant series of well-balanced comments on a series of excerpts from the Greek and Latin authors, all in his own new translations. As a small, carefully chosen anthology alone the book is quite attractive.

While, it is true, a great deal of work has been published in the field of comparative literature and influences, it is still notoriously difficult to establish the influence of the classics upon later literatures even when these seem obvious in broad aspects of tone and style. One must nevertheless demonstrate convincingly that a definite parallelism in rhetorical devices, sentence-structure and

rhythm, and in verbal borrowings exists: a tricky problem that requires a profound knowledge of the literatures compared. Even Thomson, for all his ripe learning, is forced all too often to set down a charming passage from Herodotus, Thucydides, Plutarch, Longus, Cicero, or Pliny and then to say, in effect, "How like this is to the prose of Robertson or Burke or Johnson or Sir Walter Scott!"

There are many good things in the book: the realistic explanation of a paragraph in the *De Corona*; the characterization of Livy, Sallust, and Tacitus as picturesque, sensational, and tragic historians; the discussion of the apophthegm; the lay-sermons of Seneca; shifts in taste from antiquity onward; the allegory down to the modern novel are a few of them.

Actually the book, although never very acute in its criticism nor profound in its insights, throws more light upon the classics than upon their imitators in narrative, oratory, romance, satire, and the prose of science, philosophy, or travel. It is none the less a very useful and welcome addition to that body of writing which not only shows us how greatly indebted we all are to the Greek and Latin writers but, once again, how lively and readable the classics really are.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

L. R. LIND

A. ANDREWES. *The Greek Tyrants*. ("Hutchinson's University Library: Classical History and Literature," ed. H. T. Wade-Gery.) London: Hutchinson's University Library; New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1956. Pp. 164. \$1.80 (text), \$2.40 (trade) (8s. 6d.).

This book is a comprehensive study of a broad and intricate subject; in space it extends from Homeric times to the extinction of the free *polis*.

Andrewes deals with the factors that produced tyranny, emphasizing the rise of the hoplite-class; he then moves from *polis* to *polis*, showing how tyrants conformed, or failed to conform, to pattern; he estimates acutely the contribution of tyranny to the political and economic evolution of the Greek state; and, in an Epilogue, he notes the different kind of tyrant that appeared in post-classical times. One chapter is devoted to The Spartan Alternative to Tyranny, another to Solon of Athens.

The volume is equipped with a brief Preface, a short Bibliography for the general reader, and an adequate Index. The notes (for the professional reader) are gathered at the end; a clear map of the tyrants' world appears at the beginning and end.

These pocket-books issue from the enlightened policy of British publishers since the war; the innovation has been one of the great successes of our generation. They are written by scholars for the layman; yet, though popular, they neither vulgarize nor distort. Nor, like certain popular media, do they assume that the layman is without intelligence and curiosity.

Professor Andrewes, indeed, has produced a model and paid his reader a compliment, for he admits him to the method of historical argument. And on the subject of Greek tyranny, because of the gaps in the evidence, there is much opportunity for argument. Consequently, the reader, as a collaborator so to speak, shares the excitement attendant upon the reconstruction of history. Consequently also, the professional gains from this study, for Andrewes, an independent thinker, never hesitates to propound a theory, always citing his reasoning.

It is inevitable that the historian should question cer-

tain of the conclusions here reached (e.g., why should not Delphi's rebuke to Kleisthenes have followed his victory at the Pythia of 582 rather than preceded his championship of the oracle during the Sacred War?). A short notice, however, deprives one of the pleasures of discussion.

In summary, this provocative and informative book is lucidly written, ever interesting, and unique in its field. I guarantee Professor Andrewes a wide circulation among my students and colleagues.

MALCOLM F. MCGREGOR
UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

W. D. ROSS (ed.). *Aristotelis De Anima*. ("Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis.") Oxford: At the Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1956. Pp. ix, 110. \$2.40.

This new text of *De anima* is decidedly the best now available. Hicks' well known edition (Oxford 1907) is marred by excessive dependence on one MS and by obscure punctuation, and Aurel Förster's fine text (*Aristotelis De anima libri III* [Budapest 1912]) is hardly to be obtained in the United States.

Ross' introduction is condensed from his paper, "The Text of *De Anima*," in *Autour d'Aristote: Recueil d'études . . . offert à Monseigneur A. Mansion* (Louvain 1955) 207-215. Ross follows the collations of Förster and Rabe and accepts Förster's stemma, which divides the MSS into three groups, no one of which is clearly best. Ross has improved Förster's text in two ways: by a careful examination of the ancient commentators; and, even more, by constant attention to the course of the argument, grammar, and Aristotelian usage. The many corruptions, especially in Book 3, are dealt with conscientiously by the aid of emendations, chiefly by Bonitz, Bywater, Torstrik (whose theory of a double recension in Book 3 Ross accepts only for 428^a-19-24), and the editor himself. Ross feels that there is work still to be done on the text of Book 3.

The text is followed by the fragments of Book 2 in MS E that differ from the vulgate; and by a carefully made index of Greek words, terms, and proper names.

The chief criticism that can be made of this accurately and attractively printed book is that the format of the series prevented Ross from citing the various readings of the MSS with sufficient fulness, for it is sometimes not clear what the MS evidence is for a reading adopted in the text. In this respect, Förster's edition is still useful.

HAMILTON COLLEGE

HERBERT S. LONG

E. S. FORSTER and D. J. FURLEY (edd. and trans.). Aristotle, *On Sophistical Refutations*, *On Coming-To-Be and Passing-Away* (Forster); *On the Cosmos* (Furley). ("Loeb Classical Library," No. 400.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1955. Pp. vii, 430. \$3.00 (15s.).

Any new translation of Aristotle must justify its existence by showing improvements of some sort over the Oxford Translation, edited by W. D. Ross. A comparison of these three new translations with the corresponding parts of the Oxford Aristotle will best show the nature and extent of the improvement, which is, in my opinion, not great.

W. A. Pickard-Cambridge did the Oxford version of *De soph. el.* (in Vol. I [1928]). His translation is

smoother, more vigorous and more elegant than Forster's because it keeps less close to the Greek. He alters Bekker's text about twice as many times as Forster, unnecessarily in Forster's opinion. To a general reader with no knowledge of Greek or Latin Forster's translation will undoubtedly be easier to use, for Forster has consciously aimed at a simple, straightforward English style; gives more explanatory notes; and provides a full analysis of the work in the margins instead of at the beginning. Pickard-Cambridge, on the other hand, sometimes gives a translation that will make no sense to a Greekless reader, and he occasionally uses Latin in his translation. Neither translator does much for the text, nor did the scope of the two series in which their translations are published demand it; but it is worth noting that the textual notes of both are incomplete: that is, both translators sometimes abandon Bekker to a more than trivial extent without noting the fact. To the list of translations Forster gives on page 8 should now be added the very important Italian version of the whole *Organon* with copious notes by G. Colli (Torino 1955).

Forster's version of *De gen. et corr.* is, as he himself points out, less useful than his *De soph. el.* because the former work is full of allusions that require commentary. Here there is little improvement over the Oxford Translation by H. H. Joachim (Vol. II [1922]), especially when Joachim's translation is used in conjunction with his commentary (Oxford 1922). Thus the scope of the Loeb Library at times causes translations to be published for which there is little need.

Forster did the Oxford Translation of the Pseudo-Aristotelian *De mundo* (Vol. III [1914]), of which D. J. Furley gives us a new version, simpler in style and more prosaic than Forster's, and thus less true to the rhetorical elaborateness of the original, though easier for a casual reader. Furley's notes are fuller and more elementary than Forster's, but both translators use Greek words in their notes. Furley's text represents a real improvement over the text translated by Forster, for Furley adopts upwards of two score readings from the excellent critical edition of W. L. Lorimer (Paris 1933).

Both the Greek and the English of all three treatises are remarkably free from misprints. Each treatise is provided with a brief introduction of the type customary in the Loeb Classical Library, and with select indices of Greek terms and of English proper names and subjects, except that, for the Greek index of *De gen. et corr.*, the reader is referred to Joachim's edition.

HAMILTON COLLEGE

HERBERT S. LONG

EMMETT L. BENNETT, JR. *The Pylos Tablets: Texts of the Inscriptions Found, 1939-1954*. Foreword by CARL W. BLEGEN. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press (for University of Cincinnati), 1955. Pp. xxxiii, 252. \$5.00.

Mr. Bennett's *The Pylos Tablets: A Preliminary Transcription*, published in 1951, made an epoch in Minoan-Mycenaean studies, but it antedated of course the successful Ventris-Chadwick decipherment of the Linear B syllabary. The present definitive publication differs from its predecessor in several important respects. First, it includes all the tablets discovered in the campaigns of 1952-1954, subsequent to the *Preliminary Transcription*. Second, it includes not only the texts of the inscriptions in a uniform hand, but also drawings of the tablets themselves. Thirdly, the "Vocabulary," while still arranged in the arbitrary order

of signs devised before their values were identified, provides a syllabic transcription, using all but the most doubtful of the Ventris-Chadwick identifications. Finally, now that much of the material can be more or less "read," it has been possible to revise the placing of some tablets in classes, a matter which had previously been almost entirely dependent on the ideograms denoting quantities of various substances. Better understanding of the content of the tablets has also in many cases permitted the joining of several fragments previously unrelated, and the restoration of missing portions of the text. An inevitable inconvenience arises for those who have worked with the earlier publication from the abandonment of the numbering system employed there. The binomial system is still used, with designation of class and shape of tablet by two letters, and number within this category by Arabic numerals; the numerals, however, are now the archaeologists' inventory numbers, to facilitate study of the originals in museums.

Like all of Mr. Bennett's work, this publication is a model of care and thoroughness. A very minor suggestion may be made, that the use of the vocabulary would be greatly expedited if Ventris' grid of syllabic values were printed somewhere with the page numbers of their location in the vocabulary. It is rather hard to remember the relative positions of some ninety signs arranged without any phonetic order!

LAFAYETTE COLLEGE

W. EDWARD BROWN

F. E. ADCOCK, *Caesar as Man of Letters*. Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1956. Pp. vii, 115. \$2.00.

The title of this book is somewhat misleading for little or no account is taken of lost works of Caesar or of the ancient comments on both the latter and the extant works. The author does, to be sure, open his preface by limiting his aim to the consideration of "the literary character of the writings of Caesar that have survived." Even so, it is questionable whether that limited goal has really been achieved.

Chapter 1 makes plain the difference between *commentarius* and *historia* as genres and proposes the study of Caesar's *Commentaries* in the light of this difference. In Chapter 2, the author studies the purpose and content of the *Commentaries* and makes conclusions which are hardly new and certainly not startling: (1) there is an element of propaganda in Caesar's extant works, but there is more than that; (2) the subjectivity of Caesar's writings should not be criticized too harshly since it is to be expected, etc. A book-by-book analysis of the *Gallic War* follows, but contributes little since it is no more than a series of resumés. Chapter 3, on Caesar the "Military Man," is perhaps useful for an understanding of Caesar's psychology, but little is done to relate the discussion to Caesar the "Literary Man."

Chapter 4 on Caesar's "Style and Personality" comes nearest, perhaps, to compliance with the title of the book. Following are the salient points: (1) Caesar was meticulous in his choice of words; (2) his *Gallic War* becomes progressively less formal (this point is based on the increased use of *oratio recta* from book to book); (3) Caesar's descriptions of battles "stand by themselves in ancient history-writing if we except the highest efforts of Thucydides in his Seventh Book"; (4) the *Commentaries* reflect Caesar's personality and mind; and (5) the style generally lacks rhetorical adornment, but there are

several instances in which the contrary is true.

The remainder of the book, Chapters 5 and 6, treats of the time of composition and publication of the Gallic and Civil War, the digressions in the latter, and the Caesarian Corpus, material which is important enough, but which is not wholly germane to the topic under discussion. Both a general index and an index of passages are provided.

In short, the book deals too much with Caesar's military and political activity and too little with him as a man of letters. Those portions which do get down to the business of discussing style and language are all too brief and leave much to be wanted in the matter of documentation. It is unfortunate that a book which appeared during the bimillennium of Caesar's assassination has no more to offer than does Adcock's effort. In all frankness, one can derive far more concrete information from E. G. Sihler's *Annals of Caesar* (pp. 263 ff.), which has been with us since 1911.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

WILLIAM T. AVERY

SMITH PALMER BOVIE (trans.). *Virgil's Georgics: A Modern English Verse Translation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956. Pp. xxx, 111. \$3.75.

Vergil's *Georgics* is a poem of superb artistry, considered by many critics to be the most perfect example of Roman poetry; it is not only a didactic poem for the farmers of his own day but a praise of country life which continues to charm and delight modern readers as well. In the past twelve years three translations into English verse have been published—those by R. C. Trevelyan (1944), L. A. S. Jermyn (1947), and C. Day Lewis (1947); all three were praised by reviewers, and the version by Mr. Lewis was called "a distinguished one that deserves to take the field for at least a generation."¹

Dr. Bovie, Assistant Professor of English at Barnard College, has produced a new verse translation which is equally distinguished and which, in my opinion, deserves to rank above the others; the version, in blank verse, is accurate, readable, and poetic. Mr. Lewis translates *O fortunatos nimium* (2.45ff.) as follows:

Oh, too lucky for words, if only he knew his luck,
Is the countryman who far from the clash of armaments
Lives, and rewarding earth is lavish of all he needs!
Compare with this the greater simplicity and readability of Professor Bovie's version:

Oh that farmers understood their blessings!
Their boundless joys! A land far off from war
Pours forth her fruit abundantly for them.

An excellent introduction of thirty pages treats of the historical background of the *Georgics*, the literary tradition, and the *Georgics* as a work of art; this final section explains effectively the appeal which the poem has for readers of the present day. The author's remarks (p. xxi) on parallelism and contrast, variation and balance, and verbal reminiscence and thematic counterpoint are particularly valuable, and as true of the *Aeneid* as of the *Georgics*.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH

1. L. R. Lind in CW 42 (1948-49) 192; cf. the reviews of all three translations by W. C. Greene in CPh 41 (1946) 59f.; 44 (1949) 277-279.

CARLO MARIA FRANZERO. *The Life and Times of Nero*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. Pp. 334. \$4.75.

Among the most skilled practitioners of what is known in France as *vulgarisation* was Emil Ludwig, who could combine scholarship with readability. The author of this popular life of Nero is an Italian journalist resident in England since 1922. The biography is written in a quick tempo, readable enough, filled with heightened, sometimes imaginatively dramatic, vignettes. A phrase of Suetonius or an aphoristic point made by Tacitus is enlarged into an episode. It is not an invalid technique, in a fictionized presentation such as Mann's Joseph trilogy or Feuchtwanger's Josephus trilogy. The inherent character of Nero himself and his times cannot fail to produce some modicum of effectiveness. To the general reader, indifferent to scrupulous documentation, this picture of a Roman rake's progress from his proleptically ominous birth to his ultimate calamity may find some favor.

Seneca's dichotomy is not clarified too well. Titles are given inaccurately. *Agapi* is not the plural of *agapē*. *Aeneis* is not the usual English title of the epic. The bibliography is careless in French and Latin titles. The books of the *Pharsalia* become "Cantos." *Crucifiggi* is not the Latin passive form of the infinitive. *Edile* is odd. To call Nero an "exotic being" is strange.

BROOKLYN COLLEGE

HARRY E. WEDECK

L. A. MACKAY. *Janus*. ("University of California Publications in Classical Philology," Vol. 15, No. 4.) Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1956. Pp. iii, 157-182. \$0.50.

Janus is perhaps the most enigmatic figure in the Roman pantheon except for Quirinus, with whom he is disconcertingly entangled. Dr. MacKay has attacked the problem of the original meaning and function of Janus in a brief study admirable for its direct use of the sources and its avoidance of modern inferences too often treated as facts. Most students of Roman religion would agree with him that Janus was a very old divinity whose early role became obsolete, or was preempted by another god, so that Janus survived in classical times only through the exercise of certain derived functions. The question is what was the early role. Almost every scholar has his own answer, and in view of the nature of the available evidence, there is little hope of universal agreement. Dr. MacKay's answer is that Janus was a lunar deity displaced quite early by Juno and Diana, but always preserving traces of his connection with the lunar month and with the human affairs regulated by that month.

Though the author himself expresses distrust of explanations based "on etymology alone" (159), the supplementary arguments are not strong enough in themselves to give adequate support of the thesis, which must, it seems to me, stand or fall with the "Dianus origin" and a consequent link with Diana and with the "old-and-new moon". The section on the beginning and ending of warfare, in spite of its branding the closing of 235 B.C. as "legendary," is an excellent analysis, but does little for the moon theory. (It would be in order, by the way, to refer here to Eduard Fraenkel [JRS 35 (1945) 12-14] in connection with the Janus opening in *Aeneid* 7.) If the notion of Janus antedated the use of the arch and vault in central Italy, these forms can not be called upon to explain his beginnings, whether or not the arched form

(Continued on Page 46)

Epicurus and His Gods

By A. J. FESTUGIERE, O.P. Translated by C. W. Chilton. "An excellent account of fourth-century moral and religious problems against their historical background . . . a both just and illuminating picture (most exhaustively documented) of Epicurus's own position."—THE TIMES (London) LITERARY SUPPLEMENT. With ample references, many quotations from important but inaccessible texts, a full bibliography. \$2.25

M. Tulli Ciceronis De Natura Deorum

LIBER PRIMUS

Edited, with Introduction and Commentary, by ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE, Pope Professor of Latin, Emeritus, Harvard. This book presents the text of the most important extant Latin work in comparative history and philosophy of religion. Professor Pease discusses its religious context; Cicero's purpose in writing it and its place among his other works; and its form, composition, sources, and subsequent influence, especially in early Christian thought. Revised Latin text, with apparatus of variant readings, and illustrative materials drawn from a wide range of ancient and modern writers. \$15.00

Selections From Latin Prose and Poetry

AN INTRODUCTION TO ROMAN LITERATURE

Edited by KARL POMEROY HARRINGTON and KENNETH SCOTT. This survey of the great prose and poetry of more than 50 significant Roman authors is now published by Harvard University Press. It is an ideal textbook for first year college Latin students. With notes, special vocabulary, metrical index. \$5.00

Through your bookseller, or from



HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

79 GARDEN STREET, CAMBRIDGE 38, MASSACHUSETTS

REVIEWS

(Continued from Page 44)

is "symbolically preferable" (169). It is surprising to deny Janus any connection with roads and travel (159) when one of his titles is "rector viarum" (*Macrobius Sat.* 1.9.7). The Janus data which are most definite, and least affected by subjective interpretation are topographical. It would seem safer to begin with those.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

LOUISE ADAMS HOLLAND

NORMAN H. BAYNES. *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays*. London: Athlone Press (for the University of London), 1955. Pp. vii, 392, 35s.

The contents of the present volume comprise more than thirty selected lectures, articles, and reviews written over a period of years extending from 1910 to 1951. All of them, with the exception of two lectures and one article, have previously appeared in learned periodicals in Europe and America, and are here reprinted with only slight modifications and additions. They cover a great variety of subjects, from a discussion of the political and cultural ideals of Isocrates to a defense of the tradition of University College, London, and amply attest to Professor Baynes' wide erudition, unusual productivity and remarkable breadth of interest.

In the opinion of this reviewer, the most interesting parts of the volume, for the general reader, are the first two lectures in which the author discusses, with cogency and wealth of illustration, the basic cultural ideals of East Rome and rightly emphasizes the importance of religion and *Kulturgemeinschaft* as the strongest ties that bound the people together and, in the case of religion, afforded the common man solace and comfort against human oppression and the fear of the supernatural.

As is well known, Professor Baynes is one of the most active and most respected Byzantinologists of our day. His long and tireless efforts in behalf of Byzantine studies in England, together with those of Runciman, Moss, Marshall and others, are largely responsible for the widespread interest which this comparatively new discipline is attracting at the present time in British institutions of higher learning. The present collection of some of his shorter writings will be read with great advantage and considerable profit by all those who are interested in late Roman and Byzantine history and civilization.

BROOKLYN COLLEGE

P. S. COSTAS

**RHETORICAL DEVICES IN CAESAR'S
COMMENTARIES: ADDENDA**

* * *

And now for some numbers which are always apt to bore an audience but are necessary here to corroborate the statements above. I do not pretend that these figures are absolutely accurate for, as mentioned above, I was often so swept along, so hypnotized by the manner of the telling that I frequently missed the count, even though I did retrace my steps for a re-count. Though I hit the target, I inadvertently missed the bull's eye. However, these numbers, though approxi-

mate, give a fairly valid summary on which to base literary conclusions.

Indirect Discourse (including Statements and Questions): 546 separate instances, though many are compounded in the same sentence. They occur mostly in Book VII (131), as is natural in the longest and last book; least in II.

Direct Speeches: 9 (with *inquit*); 5 in VII.
Historical Presents ("TV"): 848; 352 in VII; 240 in V; only 17 in II.

First Person: plural 33 (VII has 11); singular 20. (Was this an inadvertence, or did some ghost-writer —Hirtius, perhaps—commit the *faux pas*?)

Imperatives: 11 (none by Caesar himself!); VII has 7; none in the first three books.*

FIGURES OF RHETORIC (counting only triple or more occurrences):

Alliteration: 81 (there must be more), mostly on p.s.c. and m (23 in VII).

Anaphora: 80, mostly in V(22).

Antithesis: 61, mostly in V(17) and VII(17).

Assonance: 180, mostly s sounds, which sweep one along involuntarily.

Chiasmus: 2 (there may be more unnoticed).

Climax: every campaign in all seven books.

Anti-Climax: like the dropping of the curtain at the end of a scene in each campaign.

Litotes: comparatively few, mostly adjectival and adverbial.

Repetition: constant throughout, but mostly in the form of *Ablatives Absolute* of which there were so many coming thick and fast (there must be several hundreds) that, I confess, I lost count and did not have time to recheck accurately.

Rhetorical Questions: about 3 (in the nine direct speeches).

Rhythm: throughout—and thence to be read ALOUD.

FIGURES OF SYNTAX

Asyndeton: 214 mostly in VII (71); none in III.

* I have always liked the first one used (4.25): "Desilite!" You surely recall that famous scene where the "Marines" of Caesar's favorite Tenth Legion are about to "hit the beach," seven miles below the White Cliffs of Dover? The tough legionaries, weighed down by sixty pounds of armor and weapons, hesitate. The Eagle-bearer (his name strangely omitted in this citation) cries out: "Jump down, boys!", and then, turning toward Caesar who is watching the outcome anxiously, salutes his general and shouts out that he himself at least will have performed his duty to the Republic and to his commander.

I doubt whether a common (or uncommon) aquilifer would or could have used the Future Perfect Indicative Active, First Singular of that irregular *praestare* any more than one of our unprepared high school students. No; I think that Caesar inserted that curious form in place of the real "blankety-blank" of a hard-swearing veteran who, Caesar says, had "called on the gods" (*contestatus deos*), and, in a good example of triple Assonance on —dum, had recalled that his fellow-soldiers had (4.24) *desiliendum*, *consistendum*, *pugnandum*, all at the same time. That hero must have received some good prize money later—if he didn't drown in the strait!

Polysyndeton (mostly *et* and *sed*): 34; 13 in IV; only 1 in V.

Ellipsis: rather frequent, mostly in introductions to Indirect Statements where speeches are implied, and in the compound Infinitives and Passive tenses.

FIGURES OF SPEECH: very rare, except as mentioned above.

* * *

CHARLES W. SIEDLER

WALTON H.S., NEW YORK CITY

[The above material, omitted for reasons of space from the text of Dr. Siedler's paper in our "Caesar issue" of October 19, 1956 (CW 50 [1956-57] 28-31), should, of course, be read in connection with the main body of that paper. An extensive listing of the literature on this topic may be found in J. Cousin, *Bibliographie de la langue latine, 1880-1948* (Paris 1951) 238-239, and *Index Nominum*, s.v. *Caesar*.]

NOTES AND NEWS

The Autumn Meeting of the *Classical Association of the Atlantic States*, to be held in conjunction with the Annual Convention of the Middle States Association of College and Secondary Schools, will take place at Atlantic City, N. J., Friday and Saturday, Nov. 23-24, 1956. The program for the Saturday morning reading of papers appears at page 41 of this issue. Communications for the attention of the Executive Committee meeting on Friday afternoon may be sent to the President, Prof. John F. Latimer, George Washington University, Washington 6, D. C., or to the Secretary-Treasurer, Prof. F. Gordon Stockin, Houghton College, Houghton, N. Y.

Other fall meetings of classical societies reported to this department in connection with the compilation of material for our annual list of "Classical Societies in the United States and Canada," published in the October 5 issue (CW 50 [1956-57] 1-14), include the following:

Oct. 12-13. Kentucky Classical Association, Morehead State College, Morehead.

Oct. 13. Connecticut Section, CANE, Yale University, New Haven.

Oct. 25-27. Ohio Classical Conference, Cincinnati.

Oct. 26. Minnesota Classical Conference; Classical Section, Central-Western Zone (N.Y.); Latin Department, Eastern Tennessee Education

Association, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Oct. 27. New York Classical Club — Catholic Classical Association of Greater New York, joint meeting, Fordham University, New York City; Teachers of Classics in New England, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; Central Section, CAPS, College of Notre Dame, Belmont, Cal.

Nov. 3. Florida Classical Association, Ocala.

Nov. 10. New Jersey Classical Association, Hotel Dennis, Atlantic City.

Nov. 22-24. Southern Section, CAMWS, Jackson, Miss.

Nov. 23-24. Classical Association of the Atlantic States, Atlantic City (see above).

For details of the work of the various organizations and for other fall meetings for which exact dates were not available, readers are referred to the officers enumerated in the master list. We take the occasion again to thank these officers and others for their invaluable cooperation. As we are most eager to present as complete a record as possible of these events, we renew our request for such information, which may be sent to the CW Editorial Offices at Fordham University, New York 58, N. Y., or directly to Mr. John F. Reilly, Associate Editor, 64 Bruce Ave., Yonkers, N. Y., who will be in charge of this branch of our work.

A LIST OF CLASSICAL DEPARTMENTS

In preparation for what we confidently expect will become another annual feature of CW, the unhappy chairmen of college classical departments are currently being circularized with a request for summary information concerning their present staffs. Our inquisition runs in sum:

We are planning to inaugurate in *Classical Weekly*, Vol. 50, No. 6 (December 14, 1956), a new feature which we believe will be of unquestionable interest and service to the profession. This is an annual listing of the current staffs of classical departments (including individuals in other departments offering basically classical courses) in the colleges and universities of the United States and Canada.

For practical purposes it will probably be necessary to publish the list, at least for the first time, in two or more installments. We hope to include in the first installment as complete a report as possible on the thirty-odd departments offering both graduate and undergraduate programs . . . together with all institutions of collegiate standing in CAAS territory. Thereafter, depending upon the degree of response, we shall register other reporting institutions alphabetically or regionally-and-alphabetically.

In this undertaking we must rely heavily upon chairmen of departments. Will you, then, kindly

send us at your earliest convenience [we have allowed all of a fortnight] . . . a brief statement of the current members of your department, noting (a) academic rank; (b) new appointees (i.e. for 1956-57); (c) other pertinent information? This last might include indications of specialization, emeritus or visiting status, leaves of absence, special departmental arrangements. In general it is proposed to list only teachers at the level of full instructor or higher . . .

We suggest that, at your discretion, you include formal instruction in classical subjects offered by other departments and the names of the departments and instructors concerned . . .

This intelligence is published in the public interest—and in the hope that non-chairmen will add their opportunities to our own to insure as comprehensive and prompt a report as possible.

Meanwhile we are deliberating ways and means of rendering a comparable service (*sit venia verbo*) to our colleagues in the secondary schools. . . .

BOOKS RECEIVED

HUEBENER, THEODORE, and VOSS, CARL HERMANN. *This Is Israel: Palestine Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. Pp. x, 166; ill. \$3.75.

TJEDER, JAN-OLOF. *Die nichtliterarischen lateinischen Papyri Italiens aus der Zeit 445-700*. 2 vols. I: *Papyri 1-28*; vol. of plates. ("Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom," 4^o ser., XIX.1; XIX.3.) Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1954-55. Pp. 522; 1 pl.; ill. in text; pp. xiv, 160 pl. No price stated.

TURNER, PAUL (trans.). *Longus, Daphnis & Chloe*. ("Penguin Classics," L59.) Harmondsworth (Middlesex) - Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1956. Pp. 125. \$0.65.

VALGIGLIO, ERNESTO. *Achille, eroe implacabile: Studio psicologico sull' Iliade*. Turin: Ruata, n. d. Pp. 125. L 750.

WHEELER, FREDERIC M. *Latin*. ("College Outline Series," 104.) New York: Barnes & Noble, 1956. Pp. xxxiii, 301. \$1.95.

WHITEFIELD, B. G. *A Classical Handbook for Sixth Forms*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1956. Jp. viii, 77. 12s 6d. ". . . Scholarship candidates and those who are working for the Cambridge Tripos or the Honour School of Moderations at Oxford need . . . a considerable store of miscellaneous knowledge which they may find difficult to remember in detail and also elusive when reference is required. The book aims at supplying to some extent this need . . ." (Preface). The material comprises notes on, i.a., "Passages for Critical Comment," "Some Latin Verse Quantities," "The Greek Reflexive," "Roman and Greek Nomenclature," "Money," etc., etc.

WOOLLEY, SIR LEONARD. *Dead Towns and Living Men*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. Pp. 220; ill. \$6.00.

LATIN STIMULI

• **STIMULATE** your Latin classes by entering them in the THIRD ANNUAL LATIN EXAMINATION. This examination will be administered in March and will be of the objective type so as to be more extensive. It will be offered on the first and second year level. A separate test will be administered to first year Latin students. The enthusiasm engendered in preparation for this examination will amaze you. The difficult task of inciting students to review is one of the common problems of Latin teachers the country over. Administration of this competitive examination will, for the most part, solve that problem. Students love competition and since they are to be compared with students from all sections of the nation, many of them will do most of their reviewing outside the class, thereby saving you valuable class time. You will be able to determine the exact percentile ranking of each of your students on a national basis. A fee of \$.08 per student will be charged. Write for free copy of last year's examination with key and norms. Plaques, medals and certificates will be awarded to those students achieving a percentile ranking of 90 or higher.

• **VITALIZE** your Latin classes with dynamic tape recordings produced at leading educational institutions. Such dramatic productions as "The Odyssey" and "Cicero vs. Catiline" are included in this collection. A total of 27 stimulating programs with worksheets to go with most of the programs. Service charge of \$.50 for all 15 minute programs.

• **ANIMATE** your Latin classes with Latin Stimuli such as puzzles, games, charts, jokes, projects, activities, outline maps, grammar aids and interesting background material. Over 30 different Latin aids. New aids developed each year.

You need not remit for any of the above materials until you are completely satisfied with them and until you are sure that they can aid you in the teaching of Latin. For a free detailed listing of the above materials send this ad to:

DONALD R. HONZ

Latin Department
1902 Ogden Avenue
Superior 1, Wisconsin